#### DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 676 UD 015 702

TITLE Resegregation: A Second Generation School

Desegregation Issue.

INSTITUTION National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

Educational Equity Group. Desegregation Studies

Div.

PUB DATE 75 NOTE 33p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage

DESCRIPTORS Discipline Policy; Educationally Disadvantaged; Equal

Education: \*Grouping (Instructional Purposes);
Integration Litigation: Integration Methods;

\*Minority Group Children; Racial Integration; Racial

Segregation; Research Needs; Research Problems;

School Integration; \*School Segregation; Suspension;

\*Test Interpretation; Test Results

IDENTIFIERS National Institute of Education; NIE; \*Suburban

Migration

ABSTRACT

The emphases of this paper are identification of system mechanisms and processes employed to achieve and enhance racial resegregation in education, placing an understanding of these mechanisms and processes within the context of the national desegregation efforts, presentation of the rationale for the National Institute of Education including resegregation as a program effort within the Desegregation Studies Unit, review of current research findings and analyses in the areas of resegregation, and presentation of NIE priorities in this area. Some of the processes which facilitate resegregation are considered to be white flight, the disproportionate use of suspensions and expulsions against minority students, tracking, grouping on a racial basis, the use of test scores, and the mechanism of pushing out minority students and educators from the school system. Key researchable questions in the areas of white flight, suspensions and expulsions, and testing, tracking, and ability grouping are noted. (Author/AM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPROPERSON OF ORGANIZATION ORIGIN,
ATING IT, POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

RESEGREGATION: A SECOND GENERATION SCHOOL DESEGREGATION ISSUE

A Position Paper Prepared by the Desegregation Studies Unit National Institute of Education Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Washington, D.C.

RESEGREGATION: A SECOND GENERATION SCHOOL DESEGREGATION ISSUE

#### Preface:

This paper on issues in school resegregation is presented as both a position paper and the formulation of the research agenda for the Desegregation Studies Unit, National Institute of Education. It has as its basic purposes the following: 1) To identify system mechanisms and processes employed to achieve and enhance racial resegregation in education 2) to place an understanding of these mechanisms and processes within the context of the national desegregation efforts; 3) to present the rationale for the National Institute of Education including resegregation as a program effort within the Desegregation Studies Unit; 4) to review current research findings and analyses in the area of resegregation; and 5) to present the N.I.E. research priorities in this area.

The National Institute of Education (N.I.E.) was created by an Act of Congress in 1972. The Institute was given the mandate to attack critical problems in American education through research and development. In response to this mandate, N.I.E. has developed a strong research and problem oriented program responsive to the concerns of Congress, the educational community, and the lay public. N.I.E. has appropriately stated:

America's future is its children. The quality of education they receive, and the degree to which such schooling prepared them for later life will determine what the future will be.

In a number of areas across the nation, a variety of mechanisms have been operationalized which have the effect to restablish separate and segregated schooling for white and black children. Some of these processes and mechanisms which facilitate resegregation are 1) white flight residential relocation by whites which has the consequence of diminishing the number of white students in the city schools or the withdrawl of white students from the public school system as a means to avoid desegregation; 2) the processes of "pushing out" through a variety of mechanisms both minority students and educators from the school system; 3) the disportionate use of suspensions and explusions against minority students; 4) the tracking of minority students into curriculum areas different than those emphaized for white students; 5) grouping or assigning students to classes and other school activities on a racial basis so as to maximize racial separation; scores as a basis for the resegregation of and 6) the use of test students along racial lines.

It is the concern of the Desegregation Studies Unit to learn more of these processes and mechanisms in order to assist school personnel in their efforts to desegregate our nation's public schools.

#### PART 1

#### Background:

Twenty years after the momentous <u>Brown v. Board of Education</u> decree of the United States Supreme Court, a number of problems related to school desegregation have emerged. While some were associated with the first steps at achieving desegregated public school systems, others, frequently termed. "second generation" desegregation problems, have come into prominance.

These second generation desegregation problems are a reflection of the failure of public education, in significant ways, to achieve the goals expressed in the Brown decision. Much of our present failure has been due simply to the lack of preparation within both the educational and larger national communities to receive Americans of all backgrounds into full participation of public education. Another part of the failure, however, has been the deliberate efforts by some to forestall desegregation and to minimize its effectiveness when it does occur.

Prior to 1954, de jure segregation, separate and unequal, was clearly the law of the land in the south. Outside of the south, de facto segregation appeared to be more nearly the norm. In the south, racially separate schools were decreed by law as well as by custom. In the non-south, dicriminatory residential patterns, employment policies, and the establishment of school lines to minimize the servicing of separate and distinct racial and economic groups almost replicated in reality the conditions of the South. The assumption that segregated schools in the non-south is primarily a de facto phenomenon is presently being tested in the courts. What has been assumed to be de facto segregation in the non-south is frequently being proved to be de jure instead.

<sup>1.</sup> On June 21, 1974, the Federal District Court in Boston found that the Boston School Committee had unconstitutionally fostered and maintained a segregated school system. "The ruling was a sweeping condemnation of the Boston School Committee policies which the Court found has been 'knowingly' designed to foster segregation." (p.siv) Desegregation the Boston Public Schools: A Crisis in Civic Responsibility. United States Commission on Civil Rights, August, 1975. Denver, Indianapolis, Pontiac, and Waterbury, Connecticut are other cases in which the court found the existence of de jure segregation in the non-south.

efforts to achieve desegregated public education have encountered.

difficulties. Furthermore, it has been the minority students and educators who have born the brunt of resistance to their full participation in the educational sector of our society. It is they who have been the targets of the vast majority of efforts at resegregation.

Resegregation Processes: White Flight

The significance of "white flight" as an phenomenon influencing possibilities and potentials for school resegregation can be seen in the following tables (cf.1-3). As is evident, changes in the racial composition of American cities is not due primarily to changes in the natural increases in racial groups, but rather to the outmigration of whites. Consequently, opportunities for school integration diminish as the racial proportions in the cities change with the exodus of white residents. Table 4 focuses more specifically on the school districts themselves, both in the northern and southern regions of the country. As is evident from the forty cities in Farley's sample, white enrollment declined in all but three instances between the years 1967 and 1972. Such data give evidence of what is a broad based movement currently underway among certain segments of the American population.

The fact that such population shifts are occurring has not been lost on the American public. The concept of "white flight" is now one that

RISES IN THE PERCENT OF POPULATION OTHER THAN WHITE AND COMPONENTS OF THE RISE, 11 CITIES: 1950-60 AND 1960-70

	New York , City	Phila- delphía	Balti- more	Washing- ton, D.C.	St. Louis	Naw Orleans	Detroit	Chicago	Cleve-	γ Atlanta	Los Angeles
Percent other than white:		0									
1950	9.8	18.3	23.8	35.4	ຸ 18.0	32.0	16.4	14.1	16.4	36.6	10.8
1960	14.7	26.7	35.0	54.8	<sup>5</sup> 28.8	37.4	29.2	23.6	28.9	38.3	16.8
1970	22.8	34.1	46.9	72.1	41.3	45.4	44.5	34.4	39.0	51.6	22.8
Percent of 1950-60 rise in percent officer than white due	•						•		٠	•	· State
(1) Higher rate of natural increase among rices other			, )							·	
then white	30.2	28.3	27.8	21.3	21.4	<b>5</b> 3.7	19.2	27.8	20,3	a	32.3
(2) Imagination of races				•		¢					
6.har than value	35.4	24.9	22.7	17.2	15.2	°2.6	25.1	32.9	32.1	ä	67.7h
(3) Outsigration of whites	34.4	46.8 /	49.5	61.5	63.4	43.7	55.7	39.3	47.6	ä	
Penient of 1960-70 rise in percent of the than white ducto:	<u> </u>						,				
(1) Higher rang of natural	i		(			٠	•		*		
increase among races other than white	27.5	300	35.4	27.4	26.9	37.4	18.0	29.8	18.8	19.5	37.1
(2) ham gradion of taces other than white (3) Outraination of	44.3	13.7	14.4	9.1	73,1°	62.6°	22,8	19.0	81.2 <sup>c</sup>	25.1	56.5
whites	$28_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{p}}}$ 1	56.3	50.2	63.5	, 5, 5		59.1	51.1	J	55.3	6.4

\*SOURCE: Larry H. Long, "Racial Composition of Cities", Land Economics, p. 261

TABLE 2\*

RATE OF POPULATION CHANGE DUE TO NATURAL INCREASE AND NET MIGRATION, FOR 11 CITIES: 1950-60 AND 1960-70

		<del></del>			<u> </u>					<u>.                                      </u>		
		New York City	filila- delphia	Balti-	Washing- ton, D.C.		New Orleans	Detroit	Chicago	Cleve- land	Atlanta	Los Angele
Rate of populatio	n change di				<del>,,-</del>				<del></del>	<u></u>		
to natural increase White	;		•									•
1950-60		0.073	0.072	0.087	0.076	° 0.693	0.121	0.116	0.089	0.114	ŧa .	0.106
1965 30	,	0.051	0.038	0.036	0.005	0.025	0.056	0.036	0.052	0.067	0.074	0.078
Other rages		· -	•									
1950 60	N. T.	0.253	0.248	0.281	0.284	0.268	0.278	0.323	0.334	0.328	3	0.337
1960-70	ą	0.244	U.182	0.209	0.219	0.201	0.198	0.180	0,249	0.147	0.197	0.253
Rate of population	بان میبردیان د	1.6		•						• /		
lo mination	if change ut	ic	* -			٠.	•	*	- / _	: /		./.
White	•	~~.							$-/$ $\cdot$ $^{\circ}$	/		/:
1950- ฮี0		-0.140	-0.205	-0.244	-0.409	-0.332	0.109	-0.350	+0.215	-0.299	<b>a</b> ·	0.070
1960-70 Other races		-0.133	-0.163	-0.249	-0.392	-0.34Ò		0.327	0.238	-0.331	-0.274	-0.023
1950 60	•	0.218	0.164	0.172	0.189	0.131	0.008	0.290	0.310	0.367	/ . <b>3</b> .	0.437
1960-70		0.334	0.062	0.086	0.083	-0.012	-0.050 <sub>f</sub>	0.200	0.310	-0.011	0.175	0.637 6.287
•	•	eria alleranis indi	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			· ,		·		<del></del>		-)

<sup>\*</sup>SOURCE: Lary H. Long, "Racial Composition of Cities", Land Economics p. 263

TABLE 3"

CHANGES IN THE PERCENT OF POPULATION OTHER THAN WHITE IN PLANSAS OUTSIDE THE CENTRAL CITY:

1950-60 AND 1960-70°

•	New York, N.Y.	Phila- delphia, Pa,- N.J. <sup>b</sup>	Balli- more, • Md.	Wash- ington, D.C.— MdVa.	St. Louis, Mo.=	New Orleans, La.	Detroit, Mich.	Chicago, III.	Clevel- land, Ohio	Atlanta, Ga.	Løs Angeles Calif.
Percent other than white	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<del></del> ,		u		<del></del>	•				
1930	4.5	6.3	10.2	8. <i>7</i>	1.3	15.6	5.1	2.9	0.9	_ 13.0	2.9
1960 1970	5.0 6 3	5.7 6.1	6.9 6.2	< 6.5 8.9	1.2 1.3	14.3 11.8	3.8 3.9	3.1 3.5	1.0	8.6 6.3	4.7 8.4
Rate of population chang to outstail increase	ze due		<del></del>		. 1	u.		*		•	
White										_	• 1
1750-60	0.190	0.183	0.238		0.213	0 353	0.320	0.214	0.189	C1	0,202
10:.0-70	0.102	0.137	0.160	0.387	0.132	0.229	0.168	0.144	0.105	0.213	0.122
Office races	0.250	0.124	0.117	0.266	0.361	0.469	0.260	0.444	0.227	E	0 4110
1950-69	0.259 × 0.264	0.224 0.124	0.217 0.188		0.251	0.468 0.434	0.368 0.256	0.444 0.380	0.222	0.242	0.480
1960-70		0.124	<u>V</u> , 100	(7.43)	0.130	· 17.143**	0.400	บ.วิดิบ	0.745.	U.292	0.390
Rate of population chang	ze due		4								
to migration							•	4			ļ
Waite 1950-60	0.551	0.328	0.554	0.626	0.323	0.775	0.493	0.487	0.477	`. <b>c</b>	0.395
1960-70	0.144	0.260	0.232	0.613	0.323	0.270	0.118	0.202	0.123	0.510	0.373
e ,	= • • •	<b></b>	<b>*</b> ·			****	-	1	•••		
Other faces 1950-60	0.704	0.118	-0.018	0.235	0.051	0.451	-0.034	0.400	0.395	c	1.207
1960-70	0.331	0.232	0.046		0.347	0.066	0.048	0.149	4.231	0.006	0.732

Sourcey: See Table 1.

SOURCE: Larry H. Long, "Racial Composition of Cities", Land Economics, p. 264

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup>SMs As are defined as of 1960.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Camden Co., N.J., included with Philadelphia Co., Pa., to form central city.

<sup>\$15</sup> tensive annexations during the 1950-60 decade prohibit reliable estimation of natural increase and net migration.

#### Table 4A

Measures of School Segregation, Percentage Change in White Enrollment and Annual Growth Rates of Population for Twenty Largest Central City School Districts by Region3

#### SOUTHERN SCHOOL DISTRICTS

-	•			School	* Percentage	Growth of the	City's
•			egrega	C Inn	Change		mlat ton8
				Change °	in Witte	1760 🕏	1970
				1967	Enrollment	to	to
		1967	1972	to 1972	1967 to 1972	1970	1973
<i>•</i>							
Hous ton	_	92	80	-12	-21	. +2.4%	+2.0%
Baltimore	0	87	89	+2	-18	0.4	-1.0
Hiani <sup>a</sup>		92	67	-25	^ -3	+3.0	+2.4
Washington		77	81	· +4	-40	-0.1	-0.9
Dallas	•.	92	89	-3	-21	+2.0	-t.a
St. Louis		91	92	+Ļ	-27	-1.9	-3.3
Atlanta		95	81	-14	-54	-0.1	-2.9
MgmphLa _		95	86	-9	15	-0.2	+L.7
Jacksonvilleb		92	22	-70	<b>-21</b>	+1.5	+1.1
New Orleans	•	87	80	-7	-39	-0.6	-1.1
Hashville <sup>C</sup>	•	35	37	-48	-25	+1.1	+0.129
Fc. Lauderdale		93	43	-50	+16	+6.2	+6.1
Tampa		83	15	-73	+8	+2.1	+3.4
Biroingham \		94	81	-13	~ . <b>⊸34</b> ,	-1.3	-0.5
Fc. Worth		23	73	· <b>-</b> 20	-27	+0.7	-2.7
Kansas Clty		79	86	+7	-30	-0.3	-1.2
Tules		97	32	-15	-19	-1.0	+0.3
Charlotte		.77	13	-64	-13	+2.7	+1.7
Oklahoma City		<sup>*</sup> 97	25	-72	-39	+1.0	+0.7
San Antonio	1	83	78	-10	-13	.+0.8	+2.L

- a. Data refer to Dade County
- b. Jacksonville city is identical to Duval County.
- c. Nashville city is identical to Davidson County.
- d. Data refer to Broward County.
- e. Data refer to Hillsborough County.
- f. Data refer to Mecklenburg County.
- g. Growth rates for 1960 to 1970 are based on the city boundaries as defined in 1960. Growth rates for 1970 to 1973 are based on city boundaries as defined in 1970.

SOURCE: Farley, Reynolds "School Integration and White Flight,"

Symposium on School Desegregation and White Flight.

Center For National Policy Review, Washington, D.C. 1974.

Table 4B

Measures of School Segregation, Percentage Change in White Enrollment and Annual Growth Rates of Population for Twenty Largest Central City School Districts by Region

#### NORTHERN SCHOOL DISTRICTS

•		Measures of School Segrenation		Percentas, Change	Growt of th	ted <sup>®</sup> Abruat h Rites e City's opulation
	1967	1972	Change 1967 * to 1972	in White Enrollment 1967 to 19		1970 to 1971
Hew York	52	54	+2	~5	+9.12	-1.0%
Chicago	- 92	93	+1	-23	-0.5	-1.8
Los Angeles	89	37	-2	12	+1.2	-0.7
Decioic &	79	78	-1	-30	-1.0	-2.5
Philaielphia	75	- 31	+5	6	-0.2	-1.4
Cleveland	79_	92	+2	-13	<b>-1.5</b>	-3.1
Indianapolis	85	ે કેંદ	-4	-25	-0.9	-07
Milwaukee	-88	184	4	-19	-0.1	-1.1
San Diego	73 🦠	70	-8	₹910	*+L.8	+2.5
Columbia	81	76	<b>-</b> 5 ·	-12	+0.9	+3.1
Boston	74	7.9	• 0	<b>/ –16</b> /	r0.2	-1.1
Kewark	63	69	+1	+4	-0.6	-1.2
Clacianatt	77	76	-1	29	-1.1	÷1.9
Denver	82	53	-24	-13	/ -0.3	+).1
Portland	74	56	-18	-20	-0.2	-0.5
San Francisco	÷ 67	20	-47	-25	-0.3	-1.3
Seattle	65	62		44	<b>-</b> 0.5	-1.7
Piccsburgh	.72	74	+2	-32	-1.5	-2.5
Buffalo	80	74	-6	-17	-1.4	-2.6
Minaeapolis	. 74	. 7L	-3	-37	-1.1	-3.9 •

SOURCE: Farley, Reynolds "School Integration and White Flight,"

Symposium on School Desegregation and White Flight.

Center for National Policy Review, Washington, D.C. 1974.

accepted as part of the general discourse. Consider excerpts from the following article, written on October 15, 1975, published in The Washington Star newspaper, and entitled "Dallas--Whites Fleeing in the Face of Integration":

Likewise, consider the following data on changes in white enrollment in the Memphis, Tennessee, public schools. The dramatic shifts of the past few years has exacerbated difficulties in creating and sustaining viable integrated school settings. (Note: The Federal District Court order for the desegregation of the Memphis public schools was implemented on

January 24, 1973.)

Memphis Public Schools

TABLE 5

	20th Day of School	_White/Black	`Enrollment`	Kinderg.	Total
	Fall of	Ratio	Grades 1-12	& Spec.	Enrol1ment
	1963	50.7/49.3	109,134	877	110,011
. ***	1964	48.9/51.1	110,980	1,051	112,031
-	1965	19.8/50.2	118,995	1,233 👳	120,228
	`1966	48.4/51.6	120,877	2,121	122,998
	1967	47.4/52.6	121,508	2,500	124,008
	1968	46.3/53.7	124,896	<b>2,</b> 858	124,754
٠ ،	1969	44.8/55.2	130,952	3,551	134,503
` }	<b>197</b> 0	48.2/51.8	144,290	3,725	148,015
	1971	46.2/53.8	141,308	5,240	146,545
	1972	42.3/57.7	132,293	6,820	139,113
	1973	32.0/68.0	111,352	8,398	119,750
	<b>1</b> 974 °	29.5/70.5	106,552	9,294	115,846
Jan.	1975	29.2/70.8			116,098

Source: Edgerton, John "Public School In Memphis: Struggling, But With Head Well Above Water," Southern Journal, Spring, 1975, p.3

In any discussion of white flight it is important to note that not all "flight" necessarily implies geographic relocation. One increasing prevelant process at work which fosters resegregation is the "flight" of white students into private schools. Again, referring to Memphis, 35,365 students were in private schools during the 1974-1975 academic year. That number represents nearly a 20,000 student increase since the implementation of the desegregation plan for the public schools. On a state wide basis, the following table suggests, for selected states during 1973-1974, the number of white private academies as well as the total number estimated for the state. Though these figures are only approximate, they do suggest the dimensions to which "flight" has occurred.

Table 6
Number of White Academies and Enrollments for Selected Southern States, 1973-1974 (approximate figures)

STATE	NUMBER	OF ACADEMIES	ENROLLMENT
Louisiana		464	156,000
Kentucky	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	310	70,000
Alabama		300	26,500
Texas	<b>5</b>	775	125,000
Florida		600	140,000
Mississippi	**************************************	200	65,000
South Carolina		185	47,000

There is one additional piece of information that, at least indirectly, sheds light on the size of the private school sector in the United States. There are approximately 18,500 private elementary and secondary schools in the country. Of this number, it is known approximately 13,500 have an established policy of open admissions. There are an additional 2,500 where the enrollment policy is unclear, and there are 2,500 which have an explicit policy of non-open enrollment. It is anticipated a sizeable majority, if not nearly all, of these non-open enrollment schools are private white academies.

# Resegregation Processes: The Displacement of Black Educators

During the dismantling of the dual school system in the South, many black educators were demoted or dismissed altogether. New criteria of hiring and promotion as well as new retention procedures worked to the disadvantage of this group. Smith and Smith (1974) estimated that by 1970 in the seventeen Southern and Border States, 31,584 black teachers were displaced by discriminatory hiring and dismissals. Their data are presented in more detail in Tables 7 and 8 to follow. The consequences of such procedures are not only detrimental and destructive to the black community, but to the possibilities for generating and sustaining integrated faculties in the public schools of these states.

# Resegregation Processes: Student Suspensions and Explusions

In an extensive analysis of both the extent and the dynamics of student suspensions and explusions, School Suspensions - Are They

Helping Children, a 1975 report of the Children's Defense Fund,

Table 7

# Employment and Dollar Loss for Black Educators in Seventeen Southern and Border States

ALA. 25 268,593 10,744 9,452 12 1,292 6,954 8,984,568.  ARK. 25 107,213 4,289 3,121 27 1,168 6,445 7,527,760  DEL. 23 26,438 1,149 804 30 345 9,300 3,208,500  FLA. 24* 332,121 13,838 11,340 18 2,498 8,600 21,482,800  GA. 25 364,865 14,595 12,236 16 2,359 7,372 17,390,548,  KY. 25 61,473 2,459 1,287 47 1,172 7,624 8,935,320 8,  LA. 24 340,447 14,185 12,145 14 2,040 7,220 14,728,800  MD. 25 220,166 8,807 7,252 17 1,555 9,885 15,371,175  MISS. 24 271,932 11,331 89,163 19 2,168 6,012 13,034,016  MO. 24 141,005 5,875 3,645 37 2,230 8,091 18,042,930  N.C. 25 351,182 14,047 10,996 21 3,051 7,744 23,626,944  OKLA. 24 47,720 1,988 1,400 29 588 7,139 4,197,732  S.C. 25 262,974 10,519 8,482 19 2,037 7,000 14,259,000  TENN. 26 188,754 7,260 5,724 21 1,536 7,290 11,197,440  TEX. 23 398,187 17,312 12,672 26 4,640 7,503 34,813,920  V.A. 23 258,280 11,230 8,498 24 2,732 8,200 22,402,400  W.VA. 24 18,972 791 618 21 173 7,850 1,358,050-  TOTALS N/A 3,660,322 150,419 118,835 — 31,584 — 240,561,903	State	Overall Pupil Teacher Ratio	Number of Black Students	Expected Number of Black Teachers Under Singleton Degree Base on Pupil Teacher Ratio	Actual Number of Black Teachers 1970	Per Cent Difference	Number of Black Teachers Displaced by Discrimina- tory Hiring and Dismis- sals	Average Teacher Salary 1970	Cost to Black Community in Dollars 1970
ARK. 25 107,213 4,289 3,121 27 1,168 6,445 7,527,760 DEL. 23 26,438 1,149 804 30 345 9,300 3,208,500 FLA. 24° 332,121 13,838 11,340 18 2,498 8,600 21,482,800 GA. 25 364,865 14,595 12,236 16 2,359 7,372 17,390,548 KY. 25 61,473 2,459 1,287 47 1,172 7,624 8,935,320° LA. 24 340,447 14,185 12,145 14 2,040 7,220 14,728,800 MD. 25 220,166 8,807 7,252 17 1,555 9,885 15,371,175 MISS. 24 271,932 11,331 89,163 19 2,168 6,012 13,034,016 MO. 24 141,005 5,875 3,645 37 2,230 8,091 18,042,930 N.C. 25 351,182 14,047 10,996 21 3,051 7,744 23,626,944 OKLA. 24 47,720 1,988 1,400 29 588 7,139 4,197,732 S.C. 25 262,974 10,519 8,482 19 2,037 7,000 14,259,000 TENN. 26 188,754 7,260 5,724 21 1,536 7,290 11,197,440 TEX. 23 398,187 17,312 12,672 26 4,640 7,503 34,813,920 VA. 23 258,280 11,230 8,498 24 2,732 8,200 22,402,400 W.VA. 24 18,972 791 618 21 173 7,850 1,358,050	ΛLA.	25	268,593	10,744	9,452	. 9 -			
DEL.         23         26,438         1,149         804         30         345         9,300         3,208,500           FLA.         24*         332,121         13,838         11,340         18         2,498         8,600         21,482,800           GA.         25         364,865         14,595         12,236         16         2,359         7,372         17,390,548           KY.         25         61,473         2,459         1,287         47         1,172         7,624         8,935,320*           LA.         24         340,447         14,185         12,145         14         2,040         7,220         14,728,800*           MD.         25         220,166         8,807         7,252         17         1,555         9,885         15,371,175           MISS.         24         271,932         11,331         89,163         19         2,168         6,012*         13,034,016           MO.         24         141,005         5,875         3,645         37         2,230         8,091         18,042,930           N.C.         25         351,182         14,047         10,996         21         3,051         7,744         23,626,944		25		4,289	3,121				
GA. 25 364,865 14,595 12,236 16 2,359 7,372 17,390,548  KY. 25 61,473 2,459 1,287 47 1,172 7,624 8,935,320 %  LA. 24 340,447 14,185 12,145 14 2,040 7,220 14,728,800 MD. 25 220,166 8,807 7,252 17 1,555 9,885 15,371,175  MISS. 24 271,932 11,331 89,163 19 2,168 6,012 13,034,016  MO. 24 141,005 5,875 3,645 37 2,230 8,091 18,042,930 N.C. 25 351,182 14,047 10,996 21 3,051 7,744 23,626,944 OKLA. 24 47,720 1,988 1,400 29 588 7,139 4,197,732 S.C. 25 262,974 10,519 8,482 19 2,037 7,000 14,259,000 TENN. 26 188,754 7,260 5,724 21 1,536 7,290 11,197,440 TEX. 23 398,187 17,312 12,672 26 4,640 7,503 34,813,920 VA. 23 258,280 11,230 8,498 24 2,732 8,200 22,402,400 W.VA. 24 18,972 791 618 21 173 7,850 1,358,050			~ 26,438		804			•	
GA. 25 364,865 14,595 12,236 16 2,359 7,372 17,390,548 K-Y. 25 61,473 2,459 1,287 47 1,172 7,624 8,935,320 LA. 24 340,447 14,185 12,145 14 2,040 7,220 14,728,800 MD. 25 220,166 8,807 7,252 17 1,555 9,885 15,371,175 MISS. 24 271,932 11,331 89,163 19 2,168 6,012 13,034,016 MO. 24 141,005 5,875 3,645 37 2,230 8,091 18,042,930 N.C. 25 351,182 14,047 10,996 21 3,051 7,744 23,626,944 OKLA. 24 47,720 1,988 1,400 29 588 7,139 4,197,732 S.C. 25 262,974 10,519 8,482 19 2,037 7,000 14,259,000 TENN. 26 188,754 7,260 5,724 21 1,536 7,290 11,197,440 TEX. 23 398,187 17,312 12,672 26 4,640 7,503 34,813,920 VA. 23 (258,280 11,230 8,498 24 2,732 8,200 22,402,400 W.VA. 24 18,972 791 618 21 173 7,850 1,358,050	FLA.	24*		13,838	11,340	18			• •
KY. 25 61.473 2,459 1,287 47 1,172 7,624 8;935,320 LA. 24 340,447 14,185 12,145 14 2,040 7,220 14,728,800 MD. 25 220,166 8,807 7,252 17 1,555 9,885 15,371,175 MISS. 24 271,932 11,331 10,163 19 2,168 6,012 13,034,016 MO. 24 141,005 5,875 3,645 37 2,230 8,091 18,042,930 N.C. 25 351,182 14,047 10,996 21 3,051 7,744 23,626,944 OKLA. 24 47,720 1,988 1,400 29 588 7,139 4,197,732 S.C. 25 262,974 10,519 8,482 19 2,037 7,000 14,259,000 TENN. 26 188,754 7,260 5,724 21 1,536 7,290 11,197,440 TEX. 23 398,187 17,312 12,672 26 4,640 7,503 34,813,920 VA. 23 (258,280 11,230 8,498 24 2,732 8,200 22,402,400 W.VA. 24 18,972 791 618 21 173 7,850 1,358,050		25	364,865	14,595	12,236			-	
MD. 25 220,166 8,807 7,252 17 1,555 9,885 15,371,175 MISS. 24 271,932 9 11,331 89,163 19 2,168 6,012 13,034,016 MO. 24 141,005 5,875 3,645 37 2,230 8,091 18,042,930 N.C. 25 351,182 14,047 10,996 21 3,051 7,744 23,626,944 OKLA. 24 47,720 1,988 1,400 29 588 7,139 4,197,732 S.C. 25 262,974 - 10,519 8,482 19 2,037 7,000 14,259,000 TENN. 26 188,754 7,260 5,724 21 1,536 7,290 11,197,440 TEX. 23 398,187 17,312 12,672 26 4,640 7,503 34,813,920 VA. 23 (258,280 11,230 8,498 24 2,732 8,200 22,402,400 W.VA. 24 18,972 791 618 21 173 7,850 1,358,050		25	61,473	2,459	1,287	47			
MISS. 24 271,932 ° 11,331 ° 9,163 19 2,168 6,012 13,034,016 MO. 24 141,005 5,875 3,645 37 2,230 8,091 18,042,930 N.C. 25 351,182 14,047 10,996 21 3,051 7,744 23,626,944 OKLA. 24 47,720 1,988 1,400 29 588 7,139 4,197,732 S.C. 25 262,974 10,519 8,482 19 2,037 7,000 14,259,000 TENN. 26 188,754 7,260 5,724 21 1,536 7,290 11,197,440 TEX. 23 398,187 17,312 12,672 26 4,640 7,503 34,813,920 VA. 23 258,280 11,230 8,498 24 2,732 8,200 22,402,400 W.VA. 24 18,972 791 618 21 173 7,850 1,358,050	LA.	24	340,447	14,185		•			
MISS. 24 271,932 ° 11,331 ° 9,163 19 2,168 6,012 13,034,016 MO. 24 141,005 5,875 3,645 37 2,230 8,091 18,042,930 N.C. 25 351,182 14,047 10,996 21 3,051 7,744 23,626,944 OKLA. 24 47,720 1,988 1,400 29 588 7,139 4,197,732 S.C. 25 262,974 - 10,519 8,482 19 2,037 7,000 14,259,000 TENN. 26 188,754 7,260 5,724 21 1,536 7,290 11,197,440 TEX. 23 398,187 17,312 12,672 26 4,640 7,503 34,813,920 VA. 23 (258,280 11,230 8,498 24 2,732 8,200 22,402,400) W.VA. 24 18,972 791 618 21 173 7,850 1,358,050	MD.	25	220,166	8,807					
MO. 24 141,005 5,875 3,645 37 2,230 8,091 18,042,930 N.C. 25 351,182 14,047 10,996 21 3,051 7,744 23,626,944 OKLA. 24 47,720 1,988 1,400 29 588 7,139 4,197,732 S.C. 25 262,974 - 10,519 8,482 19 2,037 7,000 14,259,000 TENN. 26 188,754 7,260 5,724 21 1,536 7,290 11,197,440 TEX. 23 398,187 17,312 12,672 26 4,640 7,503 34,813,920 VA. 23 (258,280 11,230 8,498 24 2,732 8,200 22,402,400 W.VA. 24 18,972 791 618 21 173 7,850 1,358,050			271,932 0	. 11,331	<sup>©</sup> 9,163				
N.C. 25 351,182 14,047 10,996 21 3,051 7,744 23,626,944 OKLA. 24 47,720 1,988 1,400 29 588 7,139 4,197,732 S.C. 25 262,974 - 10,519 8,482 19 2,037 7,000 14,259,000 TENN. 26 188,754 7,260 5,724 21 1,536 7,290 11,197,440 TEX. 23 398,187 17,312 12,672 26 4,640 7,503 34,813,920 VA. 23 (258,280 11,230 8,498 24 2,732 8,200 22,402,400 W.VA. 24 18,972 791 618 21 173 7,850 1,358,050		24	141,005	5,875	3,645				
OKLA.     24     47,720     1,988     1,400     -29     588     7,139     4,197,732       S.C.     25     262,974     - 10,519     8,482     19     2,037     7,000     14,259,000       TENN.     26     188,754     7,260     5,724     21     1,536     7,290     11,197,440       TEX.     23     398,187     17,312     12,672     26     4,640     7,503     34,813,920       VA.     23     258,280     11,230     8,498     24     2,732     8,200     22,402,400       W.VA.     24     18,972     791     618     21     173     7,850     1,358,050			351,182	14,047	10,996	21			
S.C. 25 262,974 - 10,519 8,482 19 2,037 7,000 14,259,000 TENN. 26 188,754 7,260 5,724 21 1,536 7,290 11,197,440 TEX. 23 398,187 17,312 12,672 26 4,640 7,503 34,813,920 VA. 23 258,280 11,230 8,498 24 2,732 8,200 22,402,400 W.VA. 24 18,972 791 618 21 173 7,850 1,358,050-			47,720	1,988	1,400 🚟	29		-	
TENN.     26     188,754     7,260     5,724     21:     1,536     7,290     11,197,440       TEX.     23     398,187     17,312     12,672     26     4,640     7,503     34,813,920       VA.     23     258,280     11,230     8,498     24     2,732     8,200     22,402,400       W.VA.     24     18,972     791     618     21     173     7,850     1,358,050			262,974	10,519	8,482			-	
TEX.     23     398,187     17,312     12,672     26     4,640     7,503     34,813,920       VA.     23     258,280     11,230     8,498     24     2,732     8,200     22,402,400       W.VA.     24     18,972     791     618     21     173     7,850     1,358,050		26	188,754	7,260	5,724	21 -	1,536		
VA. 23 258,280 11,230 8,498 24 2,732 8,200 22,402,400 W.VA. 24 18,972 791 618 21 173 7,850 1,358,050				× 17,312	12,672	. 26	4,640		
W.VA. 24 18,972 791 618 21 173 7,850 1,358,050			258,280		- 8,498	24	2,732	8,200	22,402,400
			18,972		618	21		7,850	1,358,050
			•	150,419	118,835		31,584	· ·	240,561,903

SOURCE: Smith, John and Bette M. Smith, "Desegregation in the South and the Demise of the Black Educator," <u>Journal of Social and Behavioral Sciences</u>.

Vol., 20, No. 1. (Winter, 1974) p. 35.

provides ample data on the scope of this problem. The report noted that more than one million students were suspended at some time during the 1972-1973 academic year. The largest majority of such suspensions were concentrated in the secondary schools whereon the average, one of every thirteen students was suspended at least once. Black students during this time period were suspended at more than twice the rate of any other racial or ethnic group. The report interpreted this rate in the following fashion. They suggested it was due "in large parts to the result of racial discrimination, insensitivity, and ignorance as well as part and parcel of a pervasive intolerance by school officials for all students who are different in a number of ways." (p. 9) Tables 9 through 11 report pertinent data from the Children's Defense Fund study.

Though the data in the study are two years older than that of the Children's Defense Fund study, and the number of school districts in the sample somewhat smaller, comparable findings were reported by the National Educational Association's study of 1,227 of the 2,831 school districts it surveyed during the 1970-1971 academic year. Among the findings reported in this study, the minority explusion rate was:

--double the non-minority rate in 31 districts;

<sup>2.</sup> Data for this report of the Children's Defense fund was based on the 2,862 school districts throughout the country who responded to a special survey of the Office of Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The survey was conducted in 1972 and 1973.

<sup>3. 1971</sup> Survey of Minority explusion in 2,831 Districts, NEA Teacher Rights.

TABLE 8

Employment Rate Black Principals, vs. White Principals in the South

During the Sixties

Black Principals

		ob Redu	ction	
STATE	YEARS(S)	FROM	то	WHITE PRINCIPALS HIRED
Ala.a	1966-70	210	57	
Ark.	1963-71	134	14 -	
Fla,	1965-70	102		<del></del>
Ga. <sup>D</sup>	1968-70	•	:	75
Ky.	1965-69	350	36	3 <del>-70</del>
La.c.	1968-70		<b>\\ .</b>	68
Miss. <sup>d</sup> Md.	1954-68	44	31	From 167 in 1954 to 280 in 1968
N.C.	. 1963-70	227	_ 8	in the second second
S.C.	1965-70	114	33	
Tenn.	1965-70(?)	73	17	
Texas	No Statistics			r e
Va.	1965-70	170	16.	

aBlack junior high principals reduced from 141 to 54 bEliminated 66 or 19% of Black principalships cEliminated 68 or 19% of Black principalships dIn two-year period, 250 Black principals displaced

# Source: Smith and Smith, Ibid. p. 36.

- --triple the non-minority rate in 26 districts;
- --quadruple the non-minority rate in 16 districts;
- --five to ten times the non-minority rate in 49 districts;
- -- greater than ten times the non-minority rate in 25 districts.

But there is another story as well. The levels of suspensions and explusions are not duniform throughout the country. One finds significant variations both between cities of different states as well as between cities in the same state Consider findings of Tables 12 and 13.

Table 9 '

## Students Suspended at Least Once During the 1972-1973 School Year Suspension by Race

		-	otal luding			• . :		
			iden- fied	White	Black	Spanish	Indian	Asian.
Elementary and Secondary	Number Percent Susp. Number Percent Susp.	6 8	1.2%	471.948 3.1% 434.954 6.0%	392.437 6.07 337,384 11.8%	57,402 2.7% 51.639 6.1%	3,955 2,8% 3,485 5,6%	1,987 1.1% 1.786 2.4%
Elementary	Number Percent Surp.	<sup>6</sup> 1	19,071 ).9′ c	36.994 0.57	55 053 1.5%	5,763 0.4%	470 067	201 0.2%

SOURCE: School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children? Children's Defense Fund, Washington, D.C., 1974 p. 63

Table 10

# Twenty Worst Districts in OCR Survey for Black Student Suspensions (1972-1973)

Elementary and Secondary Schools Combined

	Ciemental y and	Number Sus- pended	District	Percent Sus- pended
Rank  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Cleveland, Ohio Orleans Parish, La. Duval County, Fla. Dallas, Independent, Tex. Memphis, Tenn. Pittsburgh, Pa. Detroit, Mich. Milwaukee, Wisc. Houston, Tex. Indianapolis, Ind. Prince Georges County Md. Caddo Parish, La. Jefferson Parish, La. E. Baron Rouge, La. Dade County, Fla. Atlanta, Ga. Richland County, S.C. Richmond, Calif.	8,412 7,993 6,628 6,324 6,173 5,694 5,560 5,401 5,181 4,643 4,438 4,262 4,014 3,960 3,634 3,354 3,354 3,018 3,011	Joliet, Ill.¹ Proviso; Ill.¹ Bloom. Ill.¹ Central Union, Calif.¹ Zion-Benton, Ill.¹ Roseville, Calif.¹ Fremont, Jhio, Worth, Ill.¹ Thorton, Ill.¹ Merced Union, Calif.¹ North Chicago, Ill.¹ Oroville Union, Calif.¹ Millville, N.J. Monmouth, N.J.¹ Ewing, N.J. Bremen, Ill.³ Delano, Calif.¹ S. Gloucester County, N.J.¹	63.9 53.1 49.6 48.0 47.2 43.6 42.2 40.4 40.1 40.0 38.0 37.0 36.5 35.2 35.0 34.8 33.6
19	Norfolk, Va. Hillshorough County, Fla.	2.882 2.850	Henderson, Ky. Sweetwater, Calif.	32.2

SOURCE: School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children? Children's Defense Fund, Washington, D.C., 1974, p. 68

Table 11

## Average Length of Suspensions for Black and White Students

		eraze Leni Suspensio	Schoo' Days Lest	
Ĝroup	Elemen- tary	Secon- 'dary	Total	Per 100 Enrolled Students
White Black	3.25 3.91	3.57 4.55	3.55 4.46	11.04 26.74

SOURCE: School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children? Children's Defense Fund, Washington, D.C., 1974 p. 71

Table 12

#### Selected Urban School Districts

			Number	ent Susper	Suspended	
	Enroll- ment	Percent Black	Sus- pended	White	Black	Over- all
Louisville, Kentucky	49,133	51.0	1,589	4.0	2.5	`3.2.
St. Louis, Missouri	105,61/7	68.8	2,799	2.7	2.6	´ 2.7

SOURCE: School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children? Children's Defense Fund, Washington, D.C., 1974 p. 70

Table 13

# Selected Ohio School Districts

	tion II	Percent Black	Number Sus- pended-	Perce	Aver-		
District	Enroll- ment			White	Black	Over- all	age Length
Fremont Xenia Sandusky Shaker Heights East Cleveland	6.962 8.271 6.943 7,097 8.168	5.3 11:3 24.4 30.0 93.8	1.383 576 362 153 820	17.4 6.5 2.7 1.4 4.7	42:2 11.0 <sub>c</sub> 12.5 3.9 10.4	19,9. 7.0 5.2 2.2 10.0	0,9 5.48 12.63 2.63 3.27

SOURCE: School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children? Children's Defense Fund, Washington, D.C., 1974 p. 70

If, as it has frequently been suggested, the characteristics of the black students prompted their suspension or explusion, we would not expect to find such wide variations, even to the point where black students are not suspended disproportionary. As the Children's Defense Fund noted in this regard, "Whether administrators consciously enforce different forms of segregation, whether they merely reflect community values and attitudes, or whether they fail to deal flexibly and creatively with curricula, teacher training, and modes of maintaining a good learning environment, it is the behavior of school administrators, rather than the behavior of children, which is in question." (p. 70)

# Resegregation Processes: Test, Tracking, and Ability Grouping

The task of developing mechanisms and procedures for achieving the goals and objectives of American education is immense. No less so appears to be the task of developing tools for accurately assessing whether and in what degree those goals are being met. Our current measurement procedures leave many dissatisfied. William Raspberry, an editoralist for the Washington Post4 began his October 11, 1975 editorial:

A perusal of the July-August (1975) issue of the National Elementary Principal Magazine might leave you wondering how standardized tests have managed to survive. In eighteen articles and an editorial the magazine devotes to the subject, it is hard to find a single kind word for standardized tests.

Raspberry also noted that much the same conclusion could be drawn from the March-April 1975 issue of the magazine where the focus was on I.Q. test.4

Though the concern over testing and its effects on children is growing, there does not appear to be a retreat from its use, nor of its central role in determining the creation of classroom groupings.

As was reported in the findings of a national task force on the effects of test scores as they impinge upon ability grouping:

- 1) Although unqualified approval of ability grouping is widespread among teachers, disproportionate numbers express a preference for teaching mixed, average, or superior classroom groups over teaching lower achieving groups.
- 2) The effect of ability grouping on the affective development of children is to reinforce favorable self-concepts of those assigned to high achievement groups, but also to reinforce unfavorable concepts in those assigned to low achievement groups.
- 3) The findings of the impact of ability grouping on classroom groups have implications for residential segregation and schooling tied to it. The issues underlying ability grouping and desegregation are deeply embedded in our society and its culture. The matters reported here are integral parts of a larger social

<sup>4.</sup> If one looks back in this same magazine two years earlier, the following comments are offered in an editorial on evaluating school personnel:

<sup>&</sup>quot;The evaluation of school personnel is, by its very nature, a complex and difficult task. But we should expect no less of an endeavor that requires us to judge human behavior in an objective and rational manner. However, it seems to us that much of the recent controversy concerning evaluation reflects our current confusion and disagreement on the goals and objectives of education."

National Elementary School Principal. February, 1973. p. 10

pattern, contributing to the perpetuation or change of that pattern, but largely determined by it.

There is an admitted difficulty in discussing the interrelations of ability grouping, testing, and desegregation. There appears to be no national and systemic research on this topic. Rather, what is available are a number of studies that focus on particular communities. Unfortunately, little recent research has been uncovered, i.e., post 1972. Thus there is an extrapolation here from older studies, and the assumption is made that the basic processes and dynamics have remained operant. Furthermore, the available evidence suggests that the use of ability grouping and curriculum tracking is national, rather than regional, and affects other minority students as well as black students.

As evidence of the ways in which resegregation does occur through tracking, consider the findings of the 1964 study by Gunthrope of Copeaque Long Island School District. Three tracks were used in the school district at the junior high level. Track "A" was the highest track. The racial composition was as follows:

Black Students	Track A	Track B	Track C	
	10%	22.6%	33.3%	
White Students	90%	77.4%	66.7%	

<sup>5.</sup> Hall, Morrill "Ability Grouping, 1970: Conclusions and Recommendations.

Center for Educational Improvement, University of Georgia, 1970, p.3

<sup>6.</sup> Gunthrope, M. B. A Comparison of Negro and White Student Participation in Selected Classes of a Junior High School Program. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1964

What makes these findings particularly provocative is that in assessing the achievement test scores of the black and white students in the seventh and eighth grades, no statistically significant differences were to be found. Black students were simply not being classified according to their actual scores.

In the now famous court case of <u>Hobson v. Hansen</u>, involving the Washington, D.C. public schools, the following data was presented indicating the interrelations of race, social class and tracking.

TABLE 14

Percents of Students in Four Tracks in Washington, D.C. High Schools, Serving Different Socioeconomic Levels of Neighborhood 1964 - 1965

Median Neighborhood	Income Special	General	Regular	Honors		
Over \$7,000 \$5,000-\$7,000 Under \$5,000	0-7.4 4.7 9.9 9.8.18.2	7.8-43.7 39.0-57.7 54.4-74.5	46.1-80.0 32.9-49.2.	10.2-17.1		

Source: Findley, Warren G, Ability Grouping: 1970, Status, Impact and Alternatives, Center for Educational Improvement, Jan., 1971, p. 46.

Perhaps one of the strongest sets of data regarding the impact of variables such as race and social class on placement in one grouping or another comes from the study of the placement of educable mentally retarded children. Consider the following chart:

TABLE 15
Summary of Enrollments in Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR) Classes in 1973-74 in Five States

	Number				Number & Percent of Districts which have		Number of Districts with 5 percent 0; more of their total, White and Black			Districts Di where w probability prob that Blacks that would be wo in EMR in	Districts where probability	
	Number of Districts	of Districts Reporting EMR	Percent of Total. White and Black Enrollments in EMR Classes		Majority Majority Black Enroll- EMR Classes	Enrollments in EMR Classes			5 times greater than for Whites	10 times . greater than for Whites		
STATE	Analyzed	Classes	Total	White	Black	ments		Total				12'
ALABAMA	112	108	2.3	1.5	4.0	21 (19,4)	67 (62.0)		2	56	29.	
ARKANSAS	140	70	2.0	1.1	3.6	23 (32.9)	57 (81.4)	5.	0	26	28	6
GEORGIA	151	148	2.5	1.0	4.8	53 (35.8)	129 (87.2)	21	0	85	67	21
MISSISSIPPI	127	103	1.8	.8	2.6	51 (49.5)	90 (87.4)	4	1	23	36	8
SOUTH CAROLINA	83 °	76	2.9	1.3	5.1	39 (51.3)	65 (85.5)	17	. 1	43	30	1.4%
·_ ·							<del></del>	┬		,		

Source: Children's Defense Fund, Children Out of School. 1974. p. 103, Washington, D.C.

The cumulative impact of data such as these is that ability grouping and tracking can have a devastating impact on the ability of school districts to create and sustain truly integrated educational settings. When mechanisms are created which separate students into categories, and those categories come to have as one of their unanticipated (or anticipated) consequences the reinforcing of divisions between racial groupings in schools, the difficulties for achieving stable integrated milieus are enhanced. Furthermore, we have reason to believe that the long term consequences of such tracking and grouping are profound for life chances and adult opportunties. Thus we believe there is a need to 1) understand these processes within the schools more clearly;

2) to learn of ways in which they can be modified or ameliorated so as to minimize

their impact upon not only the racial dimensions in schools, but
the opportunities of students for a full and rewarding adult life; and
3) to pursue alternative strategies which can be implemented to,
foster integration and also allow for the diagnostic function in
education to be a helping and beneficial service.

#### PART 11

A study of the rapidly accumulating social science data on the processes of resegregation indicates that these phenomena are not restricted to any specific geographic or socio-economic locale. In addition, these data serve to expose a more fundamental issue as well--the failure of American public education to provide a quality educational experience for all children. As Flannery has noted in this regard the issue of desegregation and resegregation can be seen as components of the larger issue of equality of educational opportunity. "Desegregation has exposed the problems that exist in school systems which have been papered over because the schools have been permitted to be ethnically homogeneous." 7

Quote after quote similar to that of Flannery's could be cited in this view, but it would only be a reiteration of the obvious to say that not all children are receiving a quality education in American society. Both popularized accounts and systematic research efforts have reported on the disparaties within the public school systems across the country.

Flannery, Harold J., "The Role of The Courts in Educational Change." <u>INTERGROUP</u>, January, 1972, p.9

An examination of these disparaties by the National Education Association's Task Force on Human Rights brought them to conclude in their 1968 report:

The education available to the children of the poor is inferior in regard to the amount and quality of facilities and supplies, the kind and quality of curriculum offered, the quality of teaching and testing materials, and in the preparation and experience of the professional staff. (p. 32)<sup>8</sup>

The Task Force further concluded:

We find neglected and dilapidated physical plants; a lack of supplies and facilities; high faculty turnover rates; questionable teacher assignments and reassignment policies; an inequitable distribution of qualified teachers; questionable curriculum standards; faculty uncertainity with respect to students' abilities and needs; programs and curriculum poorly administered and for the most part leading nowhere; high student dropout rates because of students experience little satisfaction with their school life; and students being passed on from grade to grade, always taught "at their level of need" and reaching high school simply unprepared to effectively pursue a high school course of study as it is now constituted, and who will eventually quit school or graduate into a wasteland...pp.32-33

<sup>8.</sup> Report of the Task Force on Human Rights - National Education Association

<sup>9. &</sup>lt;u>Ibid.</u> pp. 32-33

. The implication of summaries such as this and the research of many others as well is that regardless of how one wishes to define "equality of educational opportunity" not all children have it. Whether one wishes to define such equality in terms of equal access to inputs (facilities, teachers, curriculum materials, etc.) or to outputs (achievement scores, graduation, equal adult opportunities, etc.), it is apparent that it is differ-Furthermore, it appears entially distributed in the population. evident that the processes of resegregation contribute to the lack of equality in the public schools, both by negating equal access to the total school resources as well as by inhibiting the opportunities and options available when finished with schooling. For these reasons, in addition to the fact that resegregation negates the nurturing and development of quality integrated settings, it is both necessary and proper that the Desegregation Studies Unit address itself to the study of these processes.

# Key Researchable Questions

In addressing itself to the study of resegregation with an eye towards developing means to minimize its impact upon the processes of desegregation, the following are seen by the Desegregation Studies Unit as key questions to be addressed at this time. Such questions are at the very center of present research and planning efforts in the Unit. They are offered here in admittedly brief form.

<sup>10.</sup> The Unit staff recognizes that these questions are not exhausive and would welcome comments, suggestions, or additions to the list.

## White Flight:

- 1) Why does white flight occur in some cities undergoing school desegregation and not in others?
- 2) What impact does the availability of private and parochical schools have upon white flight? .
- 3) Are there variations in white flight contingent upon the particular form and process of implementing school desegregation?
- 4) Does white flight slow down, stop, or continue at previous rates in cities where metropolitan desegregation plans are in effect?
- 5) Do innovations within school systems (magnet schools, etc.) influence the presence or absence of white flight?
- 6) For both the percentage minority in the school district, is there a "tipping point" which influences the presence or absence of white flight?

## Suspensions and Explusions:

- 1) Are there variations in the suspension and explusion policies between those desegregated school districts with high rates and those with low rates?
- 2) Do variations in suspension and explusion rates vary with the particular form and process of implementing school integration?

- 3) As desegregation c curs over time in a school district, can one assume there will be variations over time in rates? If such rates do occur, are ameliorative mechanisms available?
- 4) Do variations in adjudicating suspensions and explusions within desegregated school districts affect rates?
- 5) What mechanisms appear most beneficial to school districts in ensuring equal and fair procedures with respect to suspensions and explusions?
- 6) What are the long term consequences for both the academic and adult career options arising from suspension and or explusion?

# Test, Tracking, and Ability Grouping:

- 1) In what degree are universalistic vs. particularistic evaluation criteria necessary in integrated school settings to avoid resegregation?
- 2) What do we know of exemplary integrated school districts where evaluation criteria have not resulted in resegregation?
- 3) In those schools and school districts where ability grouping and tracking have led to resegregation, what policies fostered such outcomes?
- 4) Given the research evidence of the high percentage of school districts employing both between and within classroom ability grouping, are there both short-term and long-term methods

available to minimize the impact on such grouping procedures upon resegregation?

It is with these questions in mind that the Desegregation Studies
Unit is pursuing the development of its research for the
study and analysis of the processes of resegregation. It is
recognized that some very basic questions concerning the policies
and procedures of a large number of school districts in the United
States are being questioned. But it is believed that without
a scruitny and understanding of how resegregation works to thwart
the establishment of viable and humane integrated educational
settings, the accomplishment of the goals espoused in the Brown
decision more that two decades ago will continue to elude us.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, Cynthia and Provizer, Marlene, "The Souths' New-Dual School System: A Case Study," New South, A Quarterly Review of Southern Affairs, Fall, 1972
- Clark, Kenneth, "Public School Desegregation In the Seventies"

  The New South, Summer, 1972
- Edgerton, John, "Public Schools in Memphis: Struggling But With Head Well Above Water," Southern Journal, Spring 1975
- Epps, Edger G, "Impact of School Desegregation On Aspirations, Self-Concepts and Other Aspects of Personality," <u>Law and Contemporary Problems, The Courts, Social Science and School Desegregation</u>,

  Part II, School Law, Duke University, Spring, 1975
- Farley, Reynolds, "School Integration and White Flight,"

  Symposium On School Desegregation and White Flight,

  Center for National Policy Review, Center for Civil Rights,

  August, 1975
- Findley, Warren G. and Bryan, Mirian M., <u>Ability Grouping 1970 Status</u>, <u>Impact and Alternatives</u>, Center for Educational Improvement, University of Georgia, January 1971
- Flannery, Harold J., "The Role of the Courts In Educational Change",

  <u>Intergroup</u>, Western Regional School Desegregation Projects,
  University of California at Riverside, June 1972
- Gliger, Odis Glenn V. <u>Effects of Desegregation In Classroom Achievement</u>, (Doctorial dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1968)
- Glisel, Paul N., <u>I.Q. Performance</u>, <u>Educational and Occupational</u>

  <u>Aspirations of Youth In A Southern City: A Racial Comparison</u>

  (Doctorial dissertation, Vanderbuilt University, 1962)
- Green, Winifred, "Separate and Unequal Again", <u>Inequality In Education</u>, No. 14, July 1973
- Gunthorpe, Muriel B., A Comparison of Negro and White Students
  Participation In Selected Classes of a Junior High School
  Program, (Doctoral Dissertation, New York, University, 1964)
- Hall, Leon, "Race and Suspension: A Second Generation Problem" Southern Regional Council, Atlanta, Georgia April 24, 1975
- "Prepared Statement For The House Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities By Leon Hall, Director of the Southern Regional Councils School Desegregation Project."

- Hall, Morrill, "Ability Grouping: 1970 Conclusions and Recommendations", Center For Educational Improvement, University of Georgia
- Leeson, Jim, "Private School Continue To Increase In The South," Southern Education Report, November, 1966
- Long, Larry H., "How the Racial Composition of Cities Changes."
- Orfield, Gary, "Desegregation and The Social Process"
- Raspberry, William, "Standardized Tests: Redeeming Value?"
  The Washington Post, October 11, 1975
- Salinas, Guadalupe, INTERGROUP: Mexican-Americans and Desegregation of Schools. In The Southeast
- Smith, John W. and Belte M., "Desegregation In The South and The Demise of the Black Educator", <u>Journal of Social and Behavioral Sciences</u>, Winter 1974
- Walden, John C. and Cleveland, Allen D., "The South's New-Segregation Academies," Phi Delta Kappan, December 1971
- Weinberg, Meyer, <u>Desegregation Research: An Appraisal</u>, Phi Delta Kappa, May, 1970
- Wicker, Tom, "Integration and Innovation," Los Angeles Times, April 2, 1974

#### REPORTS FROM

#### AGENCIES - ORGANIZATIONS - INSTITUTIONS

- Children Out of School In America, Children's Defense Fund, October, 1974
- Desegregating The Boston Public Schools: A Crisis In Civic Responsibility
  A Report of The United States Commission on Civil Rights,
  August, 1975
- "Discrimination Has Cost Minority Educators Over 200,000 Jobs, NEA Official Asserts," NEA News, October 19, 1973
- Its' Not Over In The South, School Desegregation In Forty-three Southern

  Cities Eighteen Years After Brown, The Alabama Council on Human
  Relations et.al., May, 1972
- NEA Actions On Behalf Of Black Educators 1966-1973, A Partial View, NEA, Teachers Rights, Division, Washington, D.C., 1974
- Report of The Task Force On Human Rights, National Education Association,
- School Suspensions Are They Helping Children, Childrens Defense Fund, Washington, D.C. 1975
- The Condition of Education, Published by the National Center for Educational Statistics, Education Division, HEW, NCE 75-42
- The National Elementary Principal, February, 1973
  March April 1975
  July August 1975
- The Student Pushout, Victim of Continued Resistence To Desegregation,
  Southern Regional Council and the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Foundation,
  September, 1974